

fore the Senate on which the Senate could vote one way or the other. We studied the Senator's plan and came to the conclusion that it was not as good as the one the committee has proposed. We came to the conclusion that a \$100 deduction was not enough of an encouragement for people to participate, except wealthy people, who would get a \$70 deduction in their taxes. In the opinion of many of us, we would be giving a deduction to many people who would have put up that money anyhow. Some of those people might have strings attached to their contributions, expecting to get something out of it.

So we made another proposal. We proposed that if a taxpayer is sufficiently interested in good government, he will have an opportunity to contribute to the financing of the campaigns equally. He can mark a box on his income tax return that he is in favor of making a financial contribution to finance the campaigns of presidential candidates. The provision was worked out so that if that taxpayer is interested, he can have a dollar of his tax used to finance presidential candidates. Fifty cents of that dollar would presently go toward the Republican campaign and 50 cents of it toward the Democratic campaign. I believe that is a better way to do it, so that the candidates do not have to pad around to corporations and unions looking for money for their campaigns. They will be equally obligated to the citizens. Then we will not have to have these President's clubs or any other clubs. Once a candidate is nominated, the people take care of his financing. In effect, a citizen contributes 50 cents to both sides. The citizen makes that contribution as a matter of good government. He is not going to ask for any personal consideration. Nobody will know who he is. The \$1 he has contributed will be split 50 cents for one party and 50 cents for the other; 50 cents to President Johnson, if he runs again, and 50 cents to whomever the Republican nominee may be. This will be financing good government.

The Senator from Delaware has said that this will not solve the equal time problem. It solves that problem. Television is very expensive. Both the Republican and the Democratic candidates will have plenty of time and will have money to pay for it. Splinter parties

[P. 25349]

would not be included, unless they had votes of more than 1,500,000. So this provision solves the equal time problem which has been plaguing Congress for so long.

The provision the Senator from Delaware proposed—was studied, we had hearings on it, we had witnesses testify, we thought about it, we meditated on it, and rejected it in favor of the provision

before us today. It is the judgment of the 12 members of the Finance Committee. I regret to say it is not the judgment of four members headed by the Senator who in the beginning was the ramrod of the suggestion that we do something about campaign contributions and who now suggests that we cut it out of this very bill.

Now he finds it is inconsistent, that it is not relevant to the bill. That did not bother the Senator a bit when he was offering his campaign financing proposal.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. This provides that the taxpayer must mark his own tax return, indicating that it is his desire that a dollar of his tax money be allocated to both parties equally?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Some time ago, the Senator from Louisiana, the manager of the bill here, introduced a bill which I thought was much better than this provision. I realize perhaps this is as far as he can go at this time.

The fact of the matter is that this is the only genuinely creative idea, which I consider valuable, useful, and workable, that I have seen proposed by anybody to reach the problem of financing campaigns in this country; and I congratulate the Senator on his proposal.

The amount of money being spent on campaigns in the States and across this Nation is absolutely scandalous; and the influence, or possible influence, of powerful financial and economic interests upon our legislative bodies in this country is very dangerous. I think it is time that Congress took some action to provide financing for campaigns so that there will be no question but that the people who are elected in our States and at the national level are responsive and responsible to the people of this country, and not to big, powerful economic groups, no matter what such groups might be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a great Republican president, Theodore Roosevelt, after having been president, made the statement that presidential campaign ought to be financed with public funds, and they ought to be accounted for. That is what this measure provides. It does put every taxpayer in the position that he is encouraged to make a \$1 designation for good government out of the tax he already owes. All he has to do is mark on his tax return that he wants the dollar of his tax placed in the presidential election campaign fund, to be divided equally between the two major parties. That is all there is to it. If a third party should emerge, it is provided for. If you want to say you have got to get 15 million votes rather than 10 million votes to be re-